Question: (Woman) Last Sunday I was able to have certain glimpses of sensation of myself while I was working, and asked a question about it. And one of the things I was told was that I should - I understood it this way - was that I should ask a deeper question of myself than - - . And last night in movements I did have the same feeling of sensation, and afterwards it occurred to me that it wouldn't occur to me to ask anything of myself then. The only thing I was worried about and becoming identified with was trying to touch the moment I was in, and keep it, but not to ask myself any questions. I didn't have any questions to ask.

Mr. Nyland: And when they gave you the answer to deepen it ?

Question: That was just part of the answer.

Mr. Nyland: And you didn't understand that?

Question: No.

Mr. Nyland: And did you ask what did they mean by that?

Question: No, I didn't because I didn't realize that I didn't understand it till later.

Mr. Nyland: Can you make a distinction in sensing of superficial sensing and intensive sensing?

Question: I think I feel - -

Mr. Nyland: Try to describe if you can what you understand by sensing.

Question: Well, last night, for instance, I felt as if I could feel my body while I was doing this. I had- - -

Mr. Nyland: But there was a sensing exercise that was given, I think, by Mme. de Salzmann, wasn't there? Didn't someone tell me the first time when we had a meeting that there was an exercise?

Question: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Do you remember that?

Question: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Have you done that?

Question: I've tried.

Mr. Nyland: Good. Then tell me how you try.

Question: Well, when I sit I can sense my body, and I feel when I sense my body, I feel more rested. I can reach a point where I can have some idea of even the size of me. I feel that this is something I've never had, the fact of my size, and I feel more together.

Mr. Nyland: It ought to be more than that, you realize that?

Question: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And the sensing exercise really implies that it is an exercise, so it cannot stop at the feeling. The realization of that what I am, even if I feel it, would be away from sensing myself. Sensing in the strict sense of the word means: I become aware, I become aware of the existence of myself; and I do that by means of sensing which belongs to my physical center, my body. And I try now when I sense to establish a relationship between my mind which wishes to sense, and my body which is being sensed. And I now have that as a relationship between the two, so that that what is being sensed forms in me, in my mind a picture of the existence of it, very much like you say you become aware of the existence of yourself as you are, totality, whatever the size, or whatever it is. It is not a feeling. It is only a realization of existence. And you have to keep it very strict that it is nothing else, so that you don't go off in a feeling of recognising yourself as being alive. Because you can sense something that is dead simply because it exists. And the closer you can come to the state of deadness, the better it is for sensing.

It's interesting because my arm, for instance, if I sense my arm, it is very much alive, because the blood goes through it and all that, and I know that I can move it; but when I relax and when I get a picture of my arm existing, it is as if my arm is only there existing, and nothing else. And I think one has to be very clear first about sensing, an exercise of sensing, the establishment by means of sensing in a certain exercise in a certain order, that I get then the relationship of my head seeing one part or another part, or another, or the fourth - like in circulation: right, right, left, left - that I then after that can have a sensation of myself existing as I am. And in that way I become aware of the existence of myself, which is then registered in my mind, in some part of my mind as if nothing else exists than this, and no further description, no classification, only the fact of its existence, and no liking and no identification.

Now first that has to be quite clear what I experience, and what is meant by making this exercise. Now if I want to intensify it, I have to know what to intensify. So I must first know what I am. Now this question that you brought up. I sense myself when I do movements. I become aware of my body making certain movements, and I have to ask a question: Where is it that I register this becoming aware? With what do I see it? And in movements to sense and not to be identified with myself is extremely difficult. You see, there are two processes. One is what we talk about, sensing, using my mind, recording certain things of existence, and simply bringing that to my mind as an image. The other is: I have movements to do. I have to think about how to move. I hear or I have seen how it is being done. Someone says: "Stretch out your right arm." Well, something takes place in my mind which then first is the clarity of the thought stretching out my arm, then the command from my mind to my arm to stretch it, and then the actual stretching. All of that my mind is engaged in. Therefore when I now try with one part of my mind to become aware of my existence, and another part of my mind is directing that what I ought to do, that what requires a great

deal of attention, which in movement is my anxiety to do it right, means that I become identified with myself doing that. And at the same time, parallel to that, I have to have another part of my mind becoming aware of myself non-identified.

So there are contradictions. And very often in movements all my attention will go in the wish to do the movement right. And there will be no possibility of sensing myself. For that reason it is in my opinion quite wrong to start mixing them up. But when I do movements, and I reach a position in which position I will not move, then I can sense myself as I stand. And this of course applies to any kind of result of a movement.

With other words, I don't, I don't observe my movements or sense them, but I become aware of the posture of myself, and in that way I can sense my existence, at the same time being aware, and also fulfilling a certain law belonging to movements because it has to do with a succession of posture. You see, it is possible to do it, but it has to be separated. And when it is not separated, I always will mix it up. And that what is the heaviest, weighs the heaviest, which is my intention to do the movements right, - and there is no energy left for becoming aware.

And this is the result: I'm quite certain that anyone who is quite honest about it has to say, "Can I sense when I do the movements?" The conclusion is, "No, I don't know how to." I have a hell of a time already doing movements; I have no more time, energy. I can think about it a little bit, and when I stand, happen to stand, then one moment it may go through my mind that I would like to sense, and probably I have an impression of myself standing there. As soon as I start moving out my arm, I've lost it.

And this is the experience that people, - really, they must try. It is easy enough to say, "Do this, do that, and you ought to," and so forth. But what is your experience? So now when a statement is made, "Deepen your sensing or sensation," you ask them, "What do you mean?" I'm sorry, they won't be able to tell you.

I become aware by means of my head having a picture of that what exists. The deepening applies to the amount of attention that I can send, as it were, to my arm, which is reflected, partly taken in by my arm reflected to my head, giving the image of my arm existing. And the intensity is then dependent on the attention that is directed towards my arm. Now if it is explained like that, then I can say, "A little more attention would mean its intensification." It does not mean that I have a clear focus of that what I see. All I do is send a little more energy down there.

So again this question of intensifying certain things, it is cheapened. It is much simpler. I try to become aware; I see myself as I am; I sense certain sections of certain parts of my body; I am now awake to the fact that they exist. That is all I wish to do. I do it at times when it is convenient, or when I'm not engaged in something else, maybe sometimes when I stand, sometimes when I sit, sometimes when I walk, but not when I'm engaged in a movement. You see what I mean? And I'm interested then at that moment to be awake to my existence. All the time this question of being awake, question of consciousness, questions of awareness, question to be present to myself, so that in that moment of experience of myself existing there is no thought. It is an experience. An awareness should never become a thought. It is a fact of existing which is registered. And it registers at the moment when I exist. And I become aware of my exis-

tence at that time, and not in the past, not in the future. We talked about this last week. We talked almost ad infinitum about many of these things, and I don't want to repeat it or to overload you in any way.

A sensing exercise is excellent because it gives me the faculty of really developing for my physical center something that is an equivalent to the faculty of feeling for my emotional center. And it is a very definite function belonging to my physical center, the ability to become aware of itself. This I call a sensation. But the language that I use and really idiotic thoughts I have about it is that all the time I call it sensation when it is a feeling. And when it's a feeling, it becomes a sensation. I think I explained once that a sensation is a statement of fact in a static way, the existence as is without moving, without moving anything inside, without even having life in it. It may be whatever condition it is; it doesn't matter what condition, but it is something that simply exists.

Feeling means that the static quality has changed into a dynamic one, and that there then is a feeling, that is, a vibration, a dynamic movement of something existing as moving - quite a different thing from a sensing or a sensation. And if I know how the difference is, then I also will use my terminology much better. And I will say, "I don't feel good," - I mean I sense something that is out of order or what, and I don't want to say that my stomach is not <u>feeling</u> very well. It has nothing to do with my feeling. I may not like the state, but it is not my stomach. I don't like the state of my stomach. That is a liar, but the feeling itself of my stomach is a sensing.

Well, all right, let's not go too far into that.

<u>Question Number 2</u>: (Woman)

I have a question about doing. I have read and been told that as we are we cannot do, and I was wondering - - -

<u>Mr. Nyland</u>: Do you believe it?

<u>Question</u>: I guess I have to accept it. I'm not convinced.

<u>Mr. Nyland</u>: Why? Why? Why do you have to accept it?

<u>Question</u>: Because of what I've been told - - -

<u>Mr. Nyland</u>: Yes, but why do you accept it if it has been told? Do you believe everything that has been told by group leaders?

<u>Question</u>: No, but - - -.

<u>Mr. Nyland</u>: For heaven's sake, don't believe me. I'm telling you that right now. If you don't agree with me, fine. Never use the terminology, if I might give you a task, "it has been told."

<u>Question</u>: 'It has been told.'

<u>Mr. Nyland</u>: Never use it. "I have been told; it is in the book and therefore," things of that kind. Please don't use it. You say when you make a statement: "I know," or "I do not know." You say, "I can do," or "I cannot do," "I Think, I don't think, I feel, I don't feel, I exist, I don't exist, I have hallucinations or I don't."

All the time it is your experience that counts, and not somebody else; and no words from any group leader, I don't care who, I should take because the group leader says as something that I also ought to experience. At most I can say I have belief in a group leader, I trust him. Then I can say, "if he says that his experience is that, I'm inclined to believe him; I'm willing to try and I hope that it will be confirmed with my experience." And when it's confirmed, then I continue to have trust. If my experience does not teach me the same thing, I start to question statements of the group leader.

Let's be very clear about it. Teaching is something that I would like to acquire. That is, if I hear a teacher and he tells me to do certain things, and I'm interested, I will do them. If he says, "You go swim," and you say, "I cannot swim," he says, "Well, you go swim." If you have confidence, you go swim; maybe you drown. Nevertheless he can be that kind of a teacher. But you see, never say afterwards, "I have been told to swim," and then put the blame on the other. You see, the blame is always on you, but you have a perfect right not to try it. So if someone says, "You ought to do this and this task," you can do it and you have confidence. If you don't do it, you have a reason why you cannot do it.

Now if someone says, "It has been told that I cannot do," well, maybe Mr. Ouspensky writes it somewhere; I don't know. Maybe someone tells you, "You cannot, we cannot, you tell a lie, I tell a lie." And then I hear it, and then I say to myself, "What do you mean, I cannot do?" I know English language. I know what 'I' is, I know what 'can' is, I know what 'doing' is. 'Doing' is a certain something of my physical body being engaged in a certain form of activity. So when I say I cannot do, I may as well say I don't breathe. Of course I do! I have something I call my wish; it may not be will, but it is something that makes me alive, to some extent keeps me alive; and with that I now say I want to get up. And I get up. I'm healthy; there is a body; there is muscle; there is mind. I have an idea I want to get up. I get up. I do. You see? I do; I walk; I sit; I look. I have my eyes open. I do. All that is doing. So when they say, "You cannot do," he must mean something else.

What is it in me now when I hear it that cannot do? Well, what are we talking about? Work. Maybe he says, "I cannot do." What? Work? That is, I cannot wake up? I cannot become conscious? I cannot make an effort? It's not true. If I'm interested in work, if I'm interested in trying to wake up, if I'm interested to try to find out what is meant by being awake, what is meant by Partdolgduty, what is meant by "work on oneself" as Gurdjieff explains in "All and Everything",- and sometimes Ouspensky also says something like it - then I say, "Now what is this now that is required?"

It says to try to become aware. It means I am trying now to become present to my activity. The activity is a form of doing, so if I have to become aware of something regarding my physical ~~body~~ ~~regarding something behind that thinking feeling certain~~ I become aware of a certain form of doing, physically, emotionally or intellectually; it doesn't matter. And I have to become aware. This is a rule that I'm interested in work, that is the meaning of work, is to become aware of myself in a certain form of behavior.

So it cannot be that I cannot do. Certainly I'm doing all the time because I'm behaving all the time. Now the question is, "Can I become aware?" Now when I say I cannot do, does that mean that I cannot make an effort, or can I not reach the result that I should

reach when I make an effort to be aware? With other words, does the doing apply to the fact that I cannot be aware or does it apply to the fact that I cannot make an effort? You see, now we have it a little bit in perspective. So let's take the question: I understand now what is meant by work; I have this kind of an aim, to call it 'wake up' out of my ordinary daily sleep, to really be present to myself, to have an aim of consciousness, to have an aim of conscience maybe. Whatever it may be, for me it means that I try now to wake up to the fact that I even exist. This is the "Only Way" as it is given. It is the Way, the "Fourth Way". It's the only way according to Buddhism; it is the way, not of the monk, the fakir and the yogi; but it is the way by which I become conscious of myself as I now live, as I exist, as I do, think or feel.

The effort that I make, can I do that? Something in my mind is now clear that I have to do something. I have a concept of what is meant by trying to become aware. I can describe it. I say in trying to describe this method of work on myself I have to learn how to observe myself. It is a word that is used. Ouspensky uses it. It's in the book fortunately, so at least I can cover myself and say, "Yes, observation I know. Observation means for me: I try to see myself." Ouspensky, Gurdjieff also say I have to do this in connection with non-identification. Long patience on non-identification. I do not want to be identified. What does it mean? I do not want to judge. I want to accept that what I see as it is. I don't want to have any feeling about it. I do not want to like it or dislike it. I want to make that statement about myself as clear as I can without introducing any emotion, any feeling. And the third requirement as I've explained last time, this question of simultaneity which has to do with moment, for the time being let's not talk about it. It is a little difficult. But in any event it is a requirement.

And so the effort consists of three different steps: to become observant regarding myself, not to be identified with that what I see, and to see myself at the moment when it happens, simultaneously, with the happening to become aware of my existence. It is something that is very clear in my mind what I have to do. Now I try to do it; that is, I will now change the thought about work into an effort to work. I sit, I'm quiet, and I try now with my mind to get a picture of myself. I change the thought in the effort of trying to become aware. It implies that what takes place in my mind when I do this is that something in my mind is a little bit separate from the rest of my mind, because it is as if there is the possibility of something splitting away from me dividing something as if there is then an observer and an observee, so that there are two things which are now functioning in a certain relationship to each other. Nobody can tell me that I cannot make that effort. I mean I may be stupid, but I certainly can translate a thought into an attempt to put that thought into action. So the question of non-doing cannot refer to that.

Now what is left? That I don't reach the result of awareness, and in that sense that I cannot do. This now becomes an experience. I cannot base anything on anything I have read. I cannot base it on anything that anybody tells me. I have to base it on something I have experienced myself when I make an effort of that kind to be aware. And then when I say I cannot reach a state I call awareness, I lie to myself. There is absolutely no question about receiving an impression of myself after I make an effort of the registration of the fact of my existence and my attempt not to be identified, that

for that one moment I am aware. Again I say it's experience. If the experience doesn't check with that, then work doesn't exist. At the same time work must exist because theoretically there must be a possibility of objectivity being introduced in the subjective world. So it's neither here nor there. I'm interested in experiencing it myself.

Another reason why it is possible and why it must be: when I live in an ordinary way, and I don't know anything about consciousness, and I've never heard about Gurdjieff, and I go back in my past and I try to remember certain events and certain moments of an experience, which as we say in ordinary life, I do not forget, I will never forget. Or I will say, "It is as if it happened yesterday." It is something that is in my memory which I remember so well that at that time I had an experience of actually existing. And I see the surrounding, I see myself in it, I have an experience of something that I call an awareness at that time, and it has been unforgettable.

Now every person, <u>every</u> person, I don't care who, the street, outside the Foundation, inside the Foundation, wherever, has had at least in their lives one moment of that kind. If this is possible, if humanity as a whole, as represented by human beings of a certain level of intelligence, can have an experience of this kind, then there is the possibility for such a person, and as a matter of fact for anyone, to try to recreate, if he only has the key, that same kind of experience since he knows that the experience is within his realm. You see, it is not something that is impossible. It is something that I already have experienced. For that reason I say I could experience it again. The question is only how can I make again that kind of an experience? Do I have to wait until it happens accidentally? I'll be very happy when it does happen. Or is there a possibility of creating such conditions in which the result will be a moment of awareness for myself? Again this is work; again this is the expereence.

So what comes out of this statement, "I cannot do"? There is nothing left. And for me it becomes extremely stupid to keep on saying, "I cannot do, I cannot do, I cannot do." It is not the truth. If I want to be accurate, I can say, "I cannot keep it." Or, "I cannot really make it intense." Or, "At certain times it is impossible for me to be aware because I am engaged in too many other things and I am identified." Naturally the result of being aware, trying to make that attempt or this effort to wake up, does not mean that I can awake at any one time when I set out to do it.

And as a matter of fact what is this question of being awake? Darkness - twelve o'clock at midnight; light - twelve o'clock midday. Twelve hours in between gradually changing from dark in density to a certain period of twilight up to the zenith when the sun is there in the horizon up on top at the time of twelve o'clock - absolute, let's call it - light. In between, changing all the time. This is the state of awakeness. I'm sometimes so deep asleep I don't even know myself; sometimes so extremely awake I know everything. In between, eight o'clock, six o'clock, nine o'clock, eleven o'clock, all kind of colorations of awareness of myself, dependent sometimes on what my wish is, dependent sometimes on the conditions in which I live, dependent on the requirements that I put on myself, dependent on the intensity of wishing, realizing the necessity of it; all my curiosity, all my real interest, all my real need, all whatever the motivations may be. All that, on that depends entirely what kind of a result I

will reach. But that has nothing to do with the doing. It has to do with the condition I can reach in the terms of an awareness. And sometimes it's one percent, sometimes it's ninety-nine or so. At any one time I can do, at any one time in relation to that what I could be I may be half a percent.

But you see, that I'm not interested in. I'm interested in the positivity of my approach. If I really wish to work, and I'm positive regarding that - that is I have a sincere wish to work, to wake up, to work on myself, - then regarding that I can be a hundred percent. What is meant by a hundred percent? What is it that I wish to be if I wish to be? It is that there is a relationship between my mind and my body being seen, as if at that moment my feelings wish with all their, I would almost say,'heart', with all their solar plexus, all of me wishing to become aware. It is totality of myself, my mind, my heart, my body united in one wish to be. I then have changed from a thought, from a feeling, from a certain activity into the actuality of an existence which I call being, and it is that entity that gives me the awareness, nothing else. And at that moment I have no more thought or feeling; I am a different person. And then I enter what Nicoll would call "the new man" or new life, an existence of a different kind of a plane, not at all like ordinary life. It is as if then Heaven is on earth, and I partake, I experience that kind of, let's call it, a condition of a being in which I have lost ordinary faculties of myself, certain faculties of how to, let's call it, behave. 'I am', the real reason of 'I amness' is then that I am as being at a certain level.

It's not the end, of course. That is something also that is ephemeral. It goes. After a little while it disappears. And also if I have it as an existence at a different level and I still have a task to fulfill on earth, I have to go down to earth. I have to - what is called participate again in that what is my experience.

Do-re-mi is the development of myself regarding the possibility of evolution of myself: is 'do' - observation, impartiality, simultaneity, 'do'; 're': participation. It means I am awake and I now go back to my life and participate in my activity while remaining awake. 'Mi' of that triad is experimentation. I try now by remaining awake and by remaining participating to experiment in the behavior forms mostly of my physical body. These are the three steps, do-re-mi of that octave.

I'm not at 'fa' yet. I'm not anywhere but let's be very clear about what is needed for the first understanding of what is meant by work. And when I want to work I start with that; when I think about work I start with that, when I philosophise about work I start with that. When I engage in argument about work I start with that. And it is all the time that desire that I wish to be; and I want now to reach the state of that kind of being by means of making an effort to be awake, and that I can do. That I can do because in that my wish is as if God helps me since I sincerely wish. It is a prayer, a prayer in which all three centers are united into one. And it is a prayer and the only prayer that will be heard by the higher forces, and the only prayer that will be acknowledged, and will be given to me. This is the meaning of something in me that can be sacred and holy, and that I can cherish, and with which I want to live, and with which I now want to wake up in order to be in ordinary life like I ought to be as a harmonious, balanced, able man who can do.

But don't let's talk nonsense about having a lie, or about certain things that I cannot do. Everything of that kind of course is relative..If I'm here, I can say that what I'm doing here doesn't belong here. It's true, of course not; but it doesn't give me the right to say I cannot do, because I'm not there. It's only in relation to that that I cannot do. Then I say, "But I wish", and then the doing is expressed in my wish. It is so idiotic. Little things like that, and we argue about it; and it is just as stupid as arguing about how many angels can go on top of a pin. We lose ourselves in that kind of a dogma. We talk around it all the time, about 'work' with a capital 'W', and what do we do? And what is there as experience that I can match with anyone of group leaders when he says, "I cannot do," and I speak up and say, "I'm sorry, I can do." Statements, "I am nothing, I am nothing;" the very fact when I say I am nothing means I am something which says, "I am nothing." And I change immediately the whole aspect of my negativity into something of a positive character.

And that is the hope I have. If I say I cannot do, what hope is there for me? I may as well die. Why should I say I cannot do when, - - why be interested in ideas, in work, in Gurdjieff? Why do you think he lived? Why do you think he wrote a book for? If there was no possibility, why does Buddhism call it the Only Way? Why even Ouspensky calls it the Fourth Way? Why talk about it as a possibility if it is not within reach of some people? It doesn't mean that everybody will be like that. Certainly not. But certainly those who wish, for them it must be an open book. And they can do. They have to when it is their life, when it is their intense wish to really be. Who in God's world could prevent it?

Try to think about it, and as I say, avoid taking simply certain - a few things for granted because someone else happens to sit in a chair like this. It has no meaning whatsoever. All of us are on the road if we want to work. One is here, one is there, one is there; some are fortunate in having been in contact for years and years with ideas; and others are not maybe, not as fortunate. Some people have known Gurdjieff; others have not known Gurdjieff. What is the difference? I realize what I am. If that what I see I don't like, and I am not too smug, and I want to do some work for it, then what is there to prevent me now - and not wait until next year when I can do, so-called, or when someone tells me, "You cannot do." I say, "To hell with you! What do you know about me wishing to do? How can you tell me that I cannot do?"

In that sense we must understand this quite well. Work has a meaning. Gurdjieff didn't live for nothing at all. He produced something. He had an effect on some people. And it was necessary for him to live his life, to write the way he did, to experience for himself his life, and to manifest that in the presence of other people so that they in turn could become something like Ashiata Shiemash had as task to do as task - to convince hundred others out of the thirty initiates he surrounded himself with, hundred others who in turn again could convince hundred others.

We are far away from that, I know. Gurdjieff even himself cannot point to hundred others who can convince hundred others. I know that well enough, and in that sense I can say I am impotent and I am just a little bit of an imbecile. And it is just too damned bad that I cannot do it, but it doesn't prevent me from wishing it, and every time there is an opportunity to try to work towards it. And you can say, "So help me God; so help me Gurdjieff; so help me ideas." If I'm serious and honest with my own conscience, then there is nobody in the whole world who can ever dispute that sincerity - if I wish. The only time it can be stilled is when I die. And I can always say, "Yes, good, God will strike me dead." Let Him. At that moment I will be awake.

No, these things are quite serious, and one must not take glibly certain statements from certain people even if one id inclined to trust in them. And the very fact that they sit in a little chair different from an audience does not entitle them to make statements they themselves cannot justify. My experience is always worth much more than any kind of theory from anybody including Gurdjieff. You see, I don't live anyone else's life. I happen to live my own. I can live my own if I'm careful and if I take responsibility for it, if I live or try to live it at least according to the five rules of objective morality. And I will try to see that that what has been, you might say, given to me, or at least with which and with what I find myself - I find myself when I, when I breathe, when I so-call wake up, when I so-call am alive,-I find myself with life. I was born; I will die. During that period there is a period for which I become responsible for the maintenance of that what now makes me alive, and it is this what is called in the Bible a talent which has been given; and that talent has to be used. It was given for that purpose; it was not given to be buried. And when the Lord comes and He says, "My good servant, what have you done?" that I bring back the talent and say, "Here it is; I have taken care of it." And what happened to that man? He was sent out into the outer darkness because he didn't fulfill his obligation. But those who received five talents, they made another five; those who received ten, they made ten. That is, one takes regarding one's life a responsibility of saying, "Yes, I am, I find myself alive, maybe not awake; maybe I cannot help that I am not awake; maybe I cannot help that I was educated in such a way.

But in any event I can say to myself that I breathe, that my blood circulates, that I am to some extent healthy, and that I can talk, and that I can think, and that I can feel, and that I have different faculties of that kind which belong to me, over which I now, I , having grown up out of childhood, I take responsibility at the time of my maturity. And with that then I start to correspond to that what I believe my life is worth, and what my life ought to yield, and tot find in my life the place where I belong.

This becomes then the problem, and if I'm serious about that, I tell again,-no one can take it away, neither father, mother, nor anyone who is near or close to me. And as I say, not even God, if I pray to Him, cam take away this kind of desire if it is real with me. And there is no reason to assume that I should not have that kind of reality of my wish because it is the only way by which there can be a solution of the problem of my life, because otherwise why would I exist? Just to eat, drink, sleep? Marry, have children, a little job

and a house in the country, a couple of cars in the garage and two chickens in each pot? What is this kind of life? You see, if work weren't so serious, I wouldn't be sitting here; I wouldn't be interested. It's exactly because it is serious that I want to sit and talk. Otherwise I can just as well go somewhere else, and like Hamolinadir, go outside and grow bhoongary'. I don't need it and I don't wish it in any way that I talk about it unless I can talk about it in the seriousness which I believe work demands.

And of course I remember Gurdjieff very well. I remember how he was as a man. And even at that, not being able to understand what he perhaps may have meant, and being sufficiently in close contact with him to see over many years what it may have been that made him tick, for me it has become something that now as work it has also become part of my life. And for that reason I want to talk about that, and to try, let's say, to communicate it in such a way that it becomes real. But I have no truck with anything that has to do with just a little thought about work. It does not exist for me. For that many other books exist; philosophies, and psychologies, psychiatry, every God-damned thing under the sun can exist. And I can enjoy it, and I can just sit home and have a fine time in a nice easy chair, and read and read and read, and <u>what</u> will it help me to develop, a soul, a Kesdjan body, an ability to be? What will it be when I die? With an enlightened brain? I die! And my feeling? I also die. That dies with me when I die, - my body, my brain, my feelings, everything, man number one, two and three. They are mortal. What is the purpose of this kind of life if it dies with me? And why shouldn't it be possible, if it actually exists, to continue with that as a responsibility?

But again it means Kesdjan, it means soul, it means what Gurdjieff is talking about: Kesdjanian body, intellectual body, body of the soul. It is all throughout the book. That is the meaning of work, not just a little bit of nonsense. It means I have to become engaged, and that what I now am, that is sufficient to grow. I cannot start with a negativity and say that I cannot do.

Other questions, if you have them?

<u>Question Number 3</u>: (Woman)

I see that there are times when I feel a negative attitude is necessary. But I also see that I become completely ineffectual if I am negative, and I find it very difficult to have a negative attitude without becoming - - -

<u>Mr. Nyland</u>: If you are negative, if you have a negative attitude, you feel yourself that you are, you are in the throes of it, you cannot stop it, it is something that is quite legitimate because it is a feeling. Last week I talked about if we don't allow a negative emotion, what else will I work with? I will only work with half a cylinder. But I have it. Still I know that at that moment a great deal of energy goes almost uselessly, because it doesn't help anyone, and I'm not helped by it, only that it gives me a certain exercise of my emotional center.

How can I now go around it so that I don't lose as much and still receive the benefit that I could derive from that fact? It is when I wake up, when I now in this state of negative emotion, I become aware of the existence of myself as I am. I see a negative emotion having an effect on the condition of my body. I tense up, I have an expression on my face, I don't like it, I shrug my shoulders in some way

or other. Maybe I say something, maybe I swear; I cuss someone out. Whatever this negativity is, whichever way it expresses itself, it expresses itself by means of my physical behavior.

Now my mind is capable at that time to get a picture of this, and what is required, which is a difficulty, is not to be identified with that which he sees. (Or 'I see'). It is a difficulty. No one ever has claimed that work is easy. But it is possible. I now in the midst of this activity for some reason or other - thank God I happen to think of work. I now make an attempt, not necessarily to continue in my anger, but something is there that has halted it; it has stopped it, it has arrested it in some way. A thought comes to me, "How about work? How about trying to see myself?" I'm still angry, and I really am ready and so forth, but something takes place as I see this now, and with this seeing it is as if something is outside of me observing me. And then by association I remember: observing also has to be, "Don't be so excited. Don't identify. Do not allow yourself to be taken." All of that is associative thought; it can come when it is connected. You see, depending on the intensity of my wish to try to be awake, on the ability of myself to relax at the moment, even when I am subject to such anger or negativity - and all of that can take place maybe in one second, two seconds, five minutes; I do not know. I don't want to let it go. At the same time I lose all the time. But I want to try and try each time; I keep on trying. I do not want to say that I will be successful, but I don't want this loss of energy uselessly. I remain responsible for the energy that goes into a state of anger or a negative emotion - I'm responsible for. It is not that I want to say it doesn't exist, and I don't want to say it is useless. It is very useful if I can only, let's call it, guide it, harness it. It is energy; it is my energy, and I'm responsible for the spending of it. And I want to spend it in such a way efficiently. And I want to derive out of it the possibility of seeing myself. And then when I see myself, it loses its hold. Again I'm talking about experience; I'm not talking about hearsay.

Question: This I understand.

Mr. Nyland: That's right.

Question: I don't think I've made myself clear. The old expression, let's say, of spanking the child, for instance - - I've forgotten the exact expression - meaning not to get - -

Mr. Nyland: "Spare the rod and spoil the child"?

Question: No, spanking the child, but not being so identified with the spanking yourself - - -

Mr. Nyland: How can you?

Question: Staying apart from it - - -

Mr. Nyland: How can you?

Question: Let me see if I can explain it - - -

Mr. Nyland: Can you spank yourself without being identified?

Question: I wouldn't know how.

Mr. Nyland: No, exactly. No, no, but on the face of it, theoretically, you already determine that you need a spank. What is this that takes place in your mind? You judge. Yes. Judging means identification.

Question: Well, let me - - I'm not making myself clear at all. In the relationship between a parent and a child, no matter how old the child, there are times when one has an attitude about certain conditions in life, certain relationships. One wishes to make it known to this child. It is what I would call sometimes a negative attitude. Things that one doesn't - - -

Mr. Nyland: To the child?

Question: No, things in general that one does not approve of, shall we say.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, yes, regarding the child. Let's say the child is naughty.

Question: Well, yes, - how to make this evident, how to make one's negative - - -

Mr. Nyland: What, to the child?

Question: Well, when you say 'child', this, I don't mean really a small child.

Mr. Nyland: Oh.

Question: But even - - -

Mr. Nyland: What do you mean?

Question: Well, all right, let's say - - -

Mr. Nyland: Well, no, we're not talking about a handkerchief.

Question: No.

Mr. Nyland: We're talking about a parent and a child, aren't we?

Question: A parent and a child - - -

Mr. Nyland: Unless I talk about myself being a child, and I am also a parent; it's quite possible, of course.

Question: I mean to convey to this child, regardless of his age, be he five, ten, twenty or thirty, my attitude about certain things which could be negative. I don't approve of certain things. Now how to express this without becoming really negative? I think this is possible.

Mr. Nyland: Sure.

Question: But I'm saying that for me - - -

Mr. Nyland: Can you do it?

Question: This is not possible as I see it.

Mr. Nyland: Why not? Why not?

Question: Because this is how I think I'm identified.

Mr. Nyland: Then you can say it is not possible for you as yet.

Question: That's what I'm trying to say.

Mr. Nyland: And you would like to know how to become that.

Question: I find - - -

Mr. Nyland: Good. You have a child starting to do something naughty. You know you're going to be involved, you know? After a little while you'll be angry. You also will want to tell the child he shouldn't have done it. You become, of course, identified. But there is a little process; you know, it is not something that just comes 'boomp', like that. It is something you see coming. When to catch it? At the moment you see it coming when it is not strong as yet. When you see the child getting to be naughty, you see yourself getting to, becoming involved. I'm not as yet involved, no, no, no, no, no. I can still stay away from it. If I want to, I don't want to look. I can go somewhere else, come to myself. Ah, but I know I have educational problems; I have to tell the child something. So I stay in the other room, you know? I know in the meantime the child is already naughty. It's too bad, but - - -. And I am father; I still have to do something. So I open the door and I come in the room, and there is the child naughty. Where am I? Do I step, proceed towards the child? The closer I come, the more angry I will get, the more I lose myself. So I don't do that. I stay here; I look at it. I'm not as yet as much involved.

Maybe there is a point at which I really can say, "Wait a minute, don't get involved now. Keep to yourself. Try to be aware, try to wake up if you can; try not to be involved." Force it back as it were. You know, my mind is working; my mind is now working and trying to keep on seeing myself. You see, the result of that is that my emotions will not play with me. I don't know if you understand that?

Question: Yes, I think I do.

Mr. Nyland: The emotions need a playground. It is my physical body. They are used to it. If I take the playground away, the emotions have to stay in the emotional center. Now I occupy the playground in another relationship regarding my mind. My mind and my body are now in a relationship of being observant and observee. There is no more room for the emotional anger to play. It has to stay, and it

will also stay in emotional center. It will not become apparent; it will not show. It will be there as a vibration going on, sure; it can be excited, but I cannot as yet express it in the usual way, simply because I have become observant regarding myself being affected by the child which I don't want to approach because then I'm lost.

Now maybe once, maybe twenty times, maybe hundred times; I don't know. If it is a problem, if it is something you really want to get over, something you <u>really</u> want to solve, you solve it. But you do it in such a way that it is reasonable. You see, if I cannot swim, I'm not going to go in the water. I bathe a little bit, get my feet wet, that's all. You see, then I learn. With that maybe I acquire a certain dexterity. Maybe it is possible for me at such a time to have my body a little bit independently so that it need not immediately react to certain emotional states. It's quite possible that I can be so strong in my observing that really that is the only thing that starts to exist for me, and my emotions, they are to play, and the little child unfortunately doesn't play a part any more because I'm so busy by trying to be awake. When I am awake, the child can be as naughty as anything and I will not be able to do anything, unless in the state of being aware I can now control myself well enough, and say, "Johnny, you know that was all wrong," without being involved.

But time and time and time again. It is something that is quite difficult, especially when one is identified with the child. And our own education, the child's education, the cleverness of the child, really ourselves not knowing if that naughtiness is really naughty, or should we allow it because the child has to express itself? You know, I think I understand the problem well enough. I only say that the problem can be solved. But one has to be reasonable. And one has to allow oneself to start in a very small way with certain things that are within one's means. I cannot expect to be observant, to be aware, really to be awake when I'm engaged in, let's say, in firing someone out of the job where he didn't perform his function; or when I'm in traffic and I need all my attention to drive a car; or when I have an argument with a policeman. I cannot, and it's a little idiotic even to assume.

But what I can do is: when I'm alone, when I sit, when I want to get up, when I wash dishes, when I can take my time, when nobody is hurrying me, when I can put it down and I can lift it up, when I lose myself that I can go back again, and I say I pick it up again, and this time I will put it down and I will be awake. When I have a chance, when I sit in a chair and I say I will try to be awake, and I will go to the door; I get up, I try, and when I'm halfway I realize - another thought. I go back to the chair. I can try; I can do it. So I sit; again I collect myself; I am awake; I see it; I will walk. I go - I get a little further. But not yet because I lose myself again. I go back.

For that I need patience, I need time, I need to be by myself. I don't want to be hurried; I don't want to be criticized. But I'm interested in something that I could acquire as a means, as a dexterity, as something that could become for me a method of work. And then with that kind of attitude I try to solve day after day, hour

after hour, at a variety of different times, moments, whenever I know that I'm in a little better state, that I know that it can be a little bit more successful, instead of trying to put it in a variety of such conditions that I already know from the very beginning I will be utterly lost. And then if I try it in such conditions and I am lost, then I lose confidence. And I feel harassed and frustrated and everything that I shouldn't be, simply because I happen to aim a little too high and I must come to the conclusion, "of course I cannot do it," and also the conclusion is: "stupid fool, that I try."

If I come to the realization that there are certain things that I cannot do - Gurdjieff says in Mullah-Nassr-Eddin - Mullah-Nassr-Eddin has a saying that you cannot jump over your own knees. He means that. You know there are certain things impossible. And the wise man is he who knows what is impossible, what is possible, and what is probable. And with that what is possible I start. After that I take the probable. And after that I take the impossible. Now, yes?

Question Number 4 (Man): I have been very disappointed in the number of failures in my attempts to work. It's left me at last with sort of a lethargy.

Mr. Nyland: Why? Why do you want to work?

Question: I'm not happy with myself.

Mr. Nyland: It's not a necessity for working. One can be very unhappy. If you then try by means of work to become happy, it's not the purpose of work.

Question: I would like to change myself.

Mr. Nyland: That is different, but why? In what respect change?

Question: Well, this is where the work confuses me.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, it's quite right. That's why I ask you. You have to be very clear. One says quite easily, "I cannot work; I want to work." I still doubt it unless I know what I want to achieve, what is the aim that work could give me. It has nothing to do really with finding myself in a condition when I am unhappy. The requirement of work is that that what I find I will accept if it's unhappy or happy. I will accept it. It's a requirement of work. Unless I know how to do that, I can never work. So it can never be based on a wish to change the condition in which I am. Because immediately when I do not like what I am as, let's say, a state or an unhappiness, I am identified with that state; and then I don't like that, I don't like that state. And then I want to get out of it, and I try now to apply work which means non-identification, to something in which I'm completely identified, and it gives the 'raison d'etre' of wanting to work based on an identification.

So you see it's a contradiction in terms. It cannot be the motivation. I can regarding myself find myself in a state that I am not, let's say, becoming to that what I know I ought to be. It is that I have a certain dissatisfaction, that I am unable to control certain mechanical forms of behavior. As a result of that, I

can be very unhappy. But it is something that is a result then of a state which I state to myself that I am that. And then work can be introduced of wanting to change that state into one that is, let's say, more harmonious, or more in balance. And as a result I will be happier. But I cannot say, "I want to be happy, then I use work." No.

Question: I have been going through a dreadful time. . . .

Mr. Nyland: But no, no, not even 'dreadful'. Don't you see, when I want to understand what is meant by non-identification, I cannot use any terminology that has to do with a classification of the state in which I am. If I understand what it is to accept myself as is, it does not mean that I wish to change it. I take myself what I am, then if now am in an unhappy state, I am in an unhappy state, and as a result my body is such-and-such. I become aware of the existence of my body as a result of an unhappy state, which is now contracted, which walks like this, which cannot do this, which cannot do that. It is my body now and I observe it, and I accept the state in which it is.

I'm not interested at the present time what caused it. I see it. I become familiar. I know it is caused by a certain stupidity on my part, or conditions, or whatever it is - having to take care of my mother-in-law or whatever it might be that causes me to be what I am. But my main concern regarding work is that I become familiar with that what I now am as behavior, and in that I cannot introduce anything that has to do with feeling. I contradict the requirements of work. It means that I have to accept that what is, rotten as it is. But it is. It is a state, a state of being on a certain level. Only when I start (to) accept that, to accept it in that way, then there is a possibility, on the basis of that, to change. If it is logical, work means evolution, but it means first the foundation on which I can stand. When that statement of where I wish to stand is shifting, then how can I even base any work on anything that is like sand, that it disappears?

Some day I can talk about what is called the solidity of time within one. It is the same as the 'rock of ages' that the Bible talks about. It is that on which one can build without the waters and the rains and so forth washing it away. It means for myself that there is something in me that is not subject any more to any time or space. It is the end of the possible development of anything in me regarding time and regarding space. That means it is the consummation of the three-dimensional space and three-dimensional time which will give me a solidity within myself that is unchangeable.

From this standpoint now I try to see what I am, and I introduce into that what I see something of this unchangeability in which I now exist and in which I now live. It is the meaning of work. When I have this, when I am absolutely sure that that is what I am, and I have no further judgment, then I know with which to work; I know I can use that now because it is reality for me, that it is in that kind of a condition, then I am not under the hallucination that I'm something else.

If I say I'm unhappy, I blame outside conditions very often. I do not blame myself. If I blame myself, I see whatever the tendencies are within me as expressed in my behavior. My behavior now

becomes the object of my seeing, my observing. This establishes in me the solidity from which I will start to work, to operate from, and I will work with that what I know is so and not different, that is, my body. And I have no further hallucination about my mind and about my feeling than only that they can feel and that they can think in some way or other. And I introduce now one thing, that is, try to become aware of that what exists; and if you want to describe that it exists in such a way that it is tense, it is tense, but no further feeling with it. Now because of this introducing into myself an idea of what it is to be objective, that is as a result of an effort to try to wake up, I now introduce in this relationship of my mind and my body something in my mind that becomes objective regarding myself. And in this state of objectivity I can have a vision of what is right or wrong for myself. I cannot have it when I'm subjective man number one, two or three. But when I try to be objective, I try to be as man number four looking at one, two and three impartially.

So you see you have to start working with what you have. You row with what you have. Those are the oars with which you row, your body, the way it is, your mind, the way it is, your feeling, your education, everything that makes up what you call "you". That you accept as existing, that "you", that is "I", the part of you which sees accepts "you" as "it". And now I say, "There is a relation. This "I" - I call it "I" - now I put in charge. And this "it", it behaves and "it" is unhappy. And "it" would like something else. But "I" remain awake." And I say, "Instead of changing my state of unhappiness, I change the state of this, making it subject to something outside which dictates to do this or to do that, or to do that, and remain observant of myself doing."

By means of that my mind starts to develop in a certain way. As a matter of fact much more takes place, of course, than just by a simple operation, you might say, of trying to become aware. As a result of becoming aware, certain impressions that I receive, particularly those in my mind, do not go in my mind any more. They go somewhere else; they go to my subconscious. That is really where they belong, and my subconscious is something that has to develop because it is not operative now. It has been pushed in the background. And it ought to work, but I have to give it food. And I can only give it food when the impressions which I now receive are made conscious, active.

I mean by that, that at the moment when I receive them, I wish to be awake. When I'm awake they become active. They don't go to my brain; they go to my subconscious, somewhere here, and that starts to develop. And that grows out into something that then can affect both my conscience and my consciousness. There are two parts of my subconscious. I explained it, I think, last week. I told about the sixth and seventh sense. I made reference to the chapter on Hypnotism in "All and Everything."

Question: What chapter?

Mr. Nyland: Hypnotism. Read it. It is in Gurdjieff's book as clear as daylight for those who wish to study it. And don't expect that you can work unless you work. It is not going to be given on a nice

silver platter. By whom? Nature? Nature is against any kind of work to wake up. It's got to be in such a way that it comes, as it were, from above when I myself get into that kind of a state of reception. But you see I have to cross the "T's" and dot the "I's"; I have to make absolutely sure that I understand what is meant by it. And when I keep on saying, "I am unhappy and I would like to change," it's a little ----. Become objective regarding your unhappiness. Your unhappiness will disappear. Something else will be in existence which is you. Quite a different thing.

I live all the time in the periphery of my ordinary outside existence. I call it subjectivity; I call it my personality or whatever it is, false or not false - what the hell do I care? It is there as something that is on the periphery; it's not my essence at all, and I am not there, and I all the time lose myself in that kind of a thing. And now I wish to move this point of gravity from the outside, my personality, into something I call individuality for lack of a better word, my essence, closer to that what I really am. And this change of having not the point of the center of gravity in that what is on the periphery, but something that now moves, takes away the reason of existence of my personality in all its nice little ideas that it is unhappy. What will I care about happiness or unhappiness if I have $10,000? It's all a question of relativity. If the $10,000 is represented by something that I can call conscious life which has that kind of a value not expressed in terms of money but in terms of reality, then what is my happiness? Silly. And I myself am cheap when I take that as if it exists. I, grown-up man. Poor, sorry for myself. You see, at such a moment it is like a child, and then a little spank. You see, and then I say, "Wake up."

Start now, and don't wait. Unhappy? Who cares? You cannot live there; you know it. It's not becoming to you. What is it that one is engaged in? Work of a certain kind. "Don't you know," - you remember what Jesus said when He was twelve years, and he was found in the temple - "Don't you," almost he said, "fools, know that I have to be in the work of my Father?" Therefore He was in the temple. How often are we in the temple during the day? When we get up in the morning how often do we think about the possibility of being awake during the day? In our daily tasks, before we even have a bath, before we have breakfast, before we go out, when we dress, when we take a coat, when we meet someone, when we're at the office, when we do this, when we do that, lunch, afternoon, work, work, work, ordinary work? How much time do I spend if I total it up at the end of the day that I can honestly say I tried to make an attempt to be awake? Two minutes, three minutes maybe? No, but I'm sorry; I'm unhappy. No, you see, when one wishes to become something, one is not a child. You cut your finger; you don't run to mother, but you put your hand up so it doesn't bleed. This kind of thing, one has to have it regarding work. Work is serious. Work has nothing to do with my unfortunate, unhappy state. I'm interested in something else, something perhaps that I can take with me. Unhappiness will die with me. Maybe tomorrow someone comes and offers me a job and I'm very happy.

What is there essentially in me that can continue to live, even if everything goes down, if there is a thunderstorm or things

outside of me that disturb me,-even burning down a house,- of some kind? Where is this what is still myself? What is there in any relationship that I call when I hate, when I love, when I do this and that, that is undisturbed in me? What is untouchable in me? What is there that is the voice of God in me, as conscience, as something on which I could rely, something that always will be with me, and that I could at certain times even show if I wish?

So this week now - I won't see you next week, thank God! - work this week the way you understand work, the way, whatever you understand of work, to try to wake up to yourself in a variety of small things, not big things; and as soon as you catch yourself being sorry for yourself, you kick yourself. Try it for one week; you'll be an entirely different man, if you really try. And moreover it will give you hope.

Let's stop, huh? You don't mind? This, I think, is the last time, because I think the Segal's are already in New York, aren't they? I think they will come today, and they will probably be here tomorrow, and then you can - - - They wrote me a little note, will I still take it; and I cannot say "no", can I, for that? I hope I haven't spoiled you; I mean this in all sincerity, because I know that sometimes I speak about work in quite a different way from what is customary at the Foundation. And I must say that because if you have any sense of discrimination, you also know. And it is not that I feel that I want to disagree, but I feel that it is necessary to be, to adhere to that what I personally believe is the truth. And to that extent I hope that I have been sincere, and that I also hope that it is not to your detriment, but that it might be helpful.

Good luck. I hope you work.